

## **Overall concerns**

### **1. Term “Continuing Resource”**

CONSER agrees that specific rules for resources issued over time are better divided into labeled sections entitled: “Multipart monographs,” “Serials,” and “Integrating Resources” in order to provide consistency throughout the rules. We agree that “Continuing resources” not be used as a label for subrules. However, in the current draft, specific rules for serials are sometimes labeled “Serials” and sometimes included in a section labeled “Resources issued in successive parts.” There are even rules (e.g., 2.3.1.7) where separate subrules are labeled “Resources issued in successive parts” and “Serials,” leaving the serials cataloger to wonder if she needs to apply both subrules. This was found to be confusing even by seasoned catalogers and is a potentially serious training issue, especially when training those outside the library cataloging community. Consistently using the same categories noted above under each applicable rule will also enable users of RDA to quickly and reliably identify the rules they need whether by their own keyword searching or by mechanisms built into the Web version. If two categories apply, both should be included in the label rather than using a collective term such as “resources issued in successive parts.” Nevertheless there are important reasons why the term and the concept “continuing resource” do have a place in RDA and should be included, where applicable:

- ISBD(CR) will likely still be in existence when RDA is first published. Even if the ISBDs are eventually combined or re-grouped, continuing resources is likely to remain a category of resource, since it is the category eligible for ISSN. References to continuing resources are made in three places in the current draft, mostly in conjunction with ISBD(CR): Appendix D.1 ISBD Punctuation, once under D.1.1 (page D-1) and twice in one paragraph under D.1.2 (p. D-5). Also, in 2.3.6.1, a key title is defined as “the unique name assigned to a continuing resource ....” The term “continuing resource” should be defined and explained in applicable places in RDA as recommended under specific rules listed below.
- Because the scope of ISSN (as defined in the revision of ISO 3297) encompasses all continuing resources, this is a term that is being used by librarians, publishers and vendors. It is more widely used and understood than the term “integrating resource” which is used throughout the rules. Serials and integrating resource catalogers will expect to find the term “continuing resource” in RDA.

- Incorporation of the term and concept will keep RDA harmonized with the *ISSN Manual*, and *ISBD(CR)*. The revision of AACR2 to accommodate seriality, an effort spearheaded by the JSC, resulted in harmonization of key areas of the three standards:
  - Definitions, wording and concepts: continuing resource; serial; integrating resource
  - Transcription of title proper and key title
  - Major and minor change rules

For RDA to unilaterally abandon an internationally agreed-on term and concept sends a message to the international non-AACR community that harmonization with other international standards is no longer important.

- “Continuing resources” as a concept will appear in the overall introduction to RDA (as has been stated in many discussions about RDA) and thus the term should also appear in appropriate places in the rules themselves.

Following are places we suggest that the terms “continuing resource” or “continuing resources” appear:

#### **Overall Introduction** (not yet available)

CONSER recommends that in addition to the overall discussion of continuing resources in the introduction’s treatment of types of resources and how they are handled, this introduction should include a graphic showing a model of the bibliographic universe such as the one used in the revision of AACR Chapter 12:

<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/jscmodel.jpg>. Such a graphic would clarify the relationships between the various categories of resources. Another helpful graphic is one that would include the dimension represented by finite and continuing, thus illustrating visually that mode of issuance and intent to continue are two different aspects of seriality: <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/dimensionsseriality.jpg>. These two dimensions of seriality are often confused. If these particular graphics were used, they would need modification or updating, e.g., to add streaming resources as a new category under continuing resources.

### **Chapter 1.**

#### **1.1.1. Resource**

Add as the third bullet point: *The resource described may be continuing (e.g., a journal) or finite (e.g. a monograph intended to be complete in 5 volumes). See also 1.1.3.*

#### **1.1.2. Mode of Issuance**

Add as the last sentence under bullet point three: *The resource may be a continuing resource (e.g., a serial) or a finite resource (e.g., a multipart monograph).*

### 1.1.3. Replace “**Intended Termination**” with “**Intent to Continue**”

Such a re-wording would phrase the statement in a positive way and use a word that is more commonly used to express the concept of having no predetermined conclusion. The words “continuing” and “continuations” are familiar both within and outside the library community and also relate to the term “continuing resource.”

Re-word the rule as follows:

*Resources may also be referred to using terms that reflect a distinction between those that are complete or to be completed within a finite number of parts and those that are to be issued over time with no predetermined conclusion.*

The term multipart monograph refers to a resource...

Add:

*The term **continuing resource** refers to a resource that is issued over time with no predetermined conclusion. Continuing resources include serials and those integrating resources with no predetermined conclusion.*

The term serial refers to a resource...

Also add to the last bullet: *Apply rules for serials also to resources resulting from limited-duration activities if the resources have characteristics of serials, such as successive issues, numbering, and frequency, e.g., a daily bulletin issued during a non-recurring meeting; the quarterly activities report of a project; the annual report of an expedition; a magazine with a predetermined number of issues.*

## 2. Readability of RDA

CONSER is concerned about the heavy usage of ‘etc.’ throughout the text of RDA. It detracts from the precision/specificity of these instructions, and makes them difficult to read.

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL RULES:

## CHAPTER 1. GENERAL GUIDELINES ON RESOURCE DESCRIPTION

### 1.1. TERMINOLOGY

#### 1.1.1. Resource

1<sup>st</sup> bullet:

The new terminology “center of focus” is not more user friendly, so we see no need for a change. Also, it is more helpful to have a definition that doesn’t included the term being defined.

CONSER recommends “The term resource is used in Part I (and throughout RDA) to refer to the object or entity being described.” Another possibility would be to use the existing terminology “basis for a resource description” instead of “center of focus.”

CONSER also recommends adding as the third bullet point: The resource described may be continuing (e.g., a journal) or finite (e.g. a monograph intended to be complete in 5 volumes). See also 1.1.3.

**4<sup>th</sup> bullet:**

Dislike use of term “represent.”

CONSER recommends one of the following: comprise; contain; consist of; encompass.

**5<sup>th</sup> bullet:**

Dislike wording: “.... or it may simply be a logically discrete unit ...”

CONSER recommends wording: “... or it may form a logically discrete unit ...”

**6<sup>th</sup> bullet:**

The wording is too circular and wordy.

CONSER recommends simpler wording: “A related resource is one that is associated with the resource being described (e.g., a separately issued supplement).”

### **1.1.2. Mode of Issuance**

Dividing resources in “1.1.2. Mode of issuance” into the categories of "resource issued as a single unit", "resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously", "resource issued in successive parts", and "integrating resource" seems unnecessarily confusing. Some multipart monographs fall under the category of resources issued in two or more parts simultaneously and some multipart monographs fall under the category of resources issued in successive parts. If there are significantly different rules for multipart monographs issued simultaneously versus successively, then it would make sense to divide the world of resources that way, but that’s not the case. Analyzable multipart monographs are a case in point, because it would be confusing to construct SARs for analyzed multipart sets with title changes treated two different ways, depending on whether the pieces came out simultaneously or successively. And yet “2.3.1.11. Recording changes in the title proper” does not seem to make the same distinction that is made here, instead using the categories of a) multipart monographs; b) serials; and c) integrating resources. Confusing! And we even find “resource issued in successive parts”

difficult to say – and perhaps a potential tongue twister if needing to say it repeatedly in training staff.

CONSER recommends a return to the existing divisions:

- (1) single part monograph
- (2) multipart monograph
- (3) serial
- (4) integrating resource

with the definitions for these categories explaining the differences. Use of the long-standing terminology of “serials” and “multipart” would enable keyword searching in the electronic version of RDA, which would be very helpful for serials catalogers and others.

### **3rd bullet**

It would be helpful to specify that a "resource issued in successive parts" (now preferably called “serial”) could include separately numbered articles of an electronic journal even if they are not gathered together into issues.

CONSER recommends changing the final e.g., statement in the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to read: (e.g., the monthly issues of an electronic journal; the separately issued articles that constitute some electronic journals).

Add as the last sentence under bullet point three: “The resource may be a continuing resource (e.g., a serial) or a finite resource (e.g., a multipart monograph).”

### **4<sup>th</sup> bullet**

“Cyclical” means on a regular basis and it is not clear whether or not it covers “irregular.”

CONSER recommends use of the ISBD(CR) terminology in the last e.g. statement: (e.g., an updating Web site).

### **1.1.3. Replace “Intended Termination” with “Intent to Continue”**

Such a re-wording would phrase the statement in a positive way and use a word that is more commonly used to express the concept of having no predetermined conclusion. The words “continuing” and “continuations” are familiar both within and outside the library community and also relate to the term “continuing resource.”

Re-word the rule as follows: “Resources may also be referred to using terms that reflect a distinction between those that are complete or to be completed within a finite number of parts and those that are to be issued over time with no predetermined conclusion.”

The term multipart monograph refers to a resource...

Add:

“The term **continuing resource** refers to a resource that is issued over time with no predetermined conclusion. Continuing resources include serials and those integrating resources with no predetermined conclusion.”

The term serial refers to a resource...

Also add: “Apply rules for serials also to resources resulting from limited-duration activities if the resources have characteristics of serials, such as successive issues, numbering, and frequency, e.g., a daily bulletin issued during a non-recurring meeting; the quarterly activities report of a project; the annual report of an expedition; a magazine with a predetermined number of issues.”

## **2nd bullet**

The use of the term "series" in “series of annual reports” is potentially confusing, because we often use the term "series" is often used to mean “monographic series.”

CONSER recommends using "annual reports" as is used in the current AACR2 definition. Another option would be to make all of the terms in the “e.g.” statement plural (e.g., periodicals, annual reports, or newspapers).

### **1.1.4. Comprehensive, Analytical, and Multilevel Description**

Convoluting wording.

CONSER recommends a change in the wording: “A comprehensive description describes the resource as a whole ....”

## **1.3. CHANGES REQUIRING A NEW DESCRIPTION**

There are other changes that require a new description for a serial and an integrating resource, as mentioned in AACR2 12.2.F and LCRI 21.3B. The ALCTS publication, ***Differences between Changes Within: Guidelines on When to Create a New Record***, also covers the criteria for creating a new record.

CONSER recommends the following wording:

“When describing a serial, create a new description if any of the following changes occur:

- a) there is a major change in the title proper (see 2.3.1.11. b))
- b) there is a change in responsibility which requires a change to the primary access point (see 8.3.)
- c) there is a change in the edition statement indicating a change in the subject matter or a change in the physical medium
- d) there is a change in the physical medium in which the serial is issued

- e) there is a change in mode of issuance, e.g. serial to integrating resource or vice versa”

CONSER also endorses the AALL recommendation for changes requiring a new description for integrating resources (updating loose-leaf or online):

“When describing an integrating resource that is an updating loose-leaf create a new description when:

- a. the edition statement changes and/or the publisher issues a new base volume or volumes with an in toto replacement of the contents
- b. mode of issuance changes, e.g., monograph or serial to integrating and vice versa
- c. physical format changes, e.g., updating loose-leaf to updating database or serial

When describing an online integrating resource, create a new description when

- a. an edition statement on a resource changes and the resource described on the original bibliographic record continues to exist as a separate resource
- b. when the original URI remains active but now links to a completely different resource than that described in the bibliographic record”

## **1.4. MANDATORY ELEMENTS OF DESCRIPTION**

### **In the list:**

CONSER recommends that “Numbering within series” should be footnoted to say that it is not mandatory for serials within series.

### **1st bullet after list**

CONSER likes the option to provide a controlled access point in lieu of the mandatory statement of responsibility, but recommends use of the access point(s) alone only if the necessary authority record(s) is (are) also completed.

## **1.6. TRANSCRIPTION**

### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet, 1<sup>st</sup> option**

The paragraph above the options says to follow the general guidelines given under 1.6.1-1.6.8 when chapters 2-6 specify transcription of an element. RDA 1.6.7 says to use abbreviations (or substitute one form of abbreviation with the prescribed abbreviation) as instructed in Appendix B. We have some concerns about following this instruction, as it would mean substituting “Ill.” (assuming that will be the abbreviation for Illinois) if the resource had on it “IL”.

CONSER recommends clarifying the first option by adding the word “abbreviations”:  
"Optionally, if the agency preparing the description has established in-house guidelines for capitalization, numerals, symbols, abbreviations, etc., or has designated a published style manual, etc., (e.g., the Chicago Manual of Style) as its preferred guide, use those

guidelines or that style manual in place of the instructions given under 1.6.1-1.6.8 below and in the appendices."

#### **1.6.1.1. Capitalization of titles**

The rules for capitalization of titles should be even more simplified, because it typically affects neither filing nor indexing. Also, students often compile bibliographies and footnote citations from catalog records. When they do so, they must needlessly correct each title to follow standard manuals of style – adding to students' perceptions of libraries as outmoded and less than "user-friendly."

CONSER recommends including an option to transcribe titles as found.

### **1.6.2. Numerals and Numbers Expressed as Words**

#### **1.6.2.5. Ordinal numerals**

##### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet, footnote**

Footnote should refer to later edition: Allen, C.G. (Charles Geoffry). A manual of European languages for librarians. – 2nd ed. – London : New Providence, NJ : Bowker-Saur, c1999.

##### **Last bullet**

The wording in the last bullet would in most cases be simpler (and less time-consuming) than the instructions in the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet for catalogers unfamiliar with a particular language. This is compounded by the fact that for serials such characters would need to be entered not only at the bibliographic level, but often at the holdings level as well.

CONSER recommends to include an option to use 1., 2., 3., etc. in all cases.

### **1.6.6. Letters or Words intended to be Read More than Once**

This is a change in practice, at least for serials, since we would currently transcribe "Canadian bibliographies canadiennes" as "Canadian bibliographies = Bibliographies canadiennes." We do not think this title would be cited as transcribed and exact transcription would thus obscure identification of the title. It would also be confusing to train staff that older records were dealt with one way and newer records another. Catalogers would probably need to recatalog any existing titles, if the new wording is kept. We also think this rule could cause some unintended (at least by the publisher!) major changes for serial titles, if the publisher changed its presentation on subsequent issues. Past experience with serials publishers is that the printers can be rather creative with presentation on title pages.

CONSER has two recommendations:



- Revert to existing AACR2 practice. If this recommendation is not accepted, a decision will need to be made and documented whether a stylistic change from a title like "Canadian bibliographies canadiennes" to "Canadian bibliographies, bibliographies canadiennes" is a major or minor change in 2.3.1.12.
- Make the precise transcription a required variant title note (and added entry).

### **1.6.7. Abbreviations**

Current practice is not well understood and often misapplied with regard to some abbreviations, e.g. states in the place of publication, but substituting Ill. (assuming that will be the abbreviation for Illinois in appendix B) if the resource says IL after the name of the place of publication is not helpful.

CONSER recommends that the abbreviations in the appendix be changed to include the current post office abbreviations, since they are in standard usage today.

### **1.6.8. Inaccuracies**

The serials exception is missing here.

CONSER recommends providing a reference to 2.3.1.7.a) or moving that rule to 1.6.8.

## **1.7. FORMULATION OF NOTES**

### **1.7.1. Capitalization**

The instructions here do not seem to take into account that any sentence could begin with a compound term that begins with a lower case letter or letters followed by one or more letters in upper case (see 1.6.1.1. b)) or with an Internet address (1.6.1.1. c)).

CONSER recommends that instructions for capitalization of notes accommodate the cases given in 1.6.1.1.

### **1.7.4. Notes Citing Other Works and other Expressions or Manifestations of the Same Work**

Giving dates in notes for serials, as in the first example, is additional data to add to a catalog record – during a time when we're trying to streamline records as much as possible. Also, serials catalogers often lack the information.

CONSER recommends giving date information as an option rather than the rule.

#### **1.7.6. Combining Notes**

Wording could be clearer.

CONSER suggests rewording to: “For greater clarity, combine two or more notes into one note when appropriate.”

## **CHAPTER 2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESOURCE**

### **2.1. BASIS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESOURCE**

#### **2.1.1. Comprehensive Description**

This rule creates difficulties with its different instructions for multipart monographs that have successively issued parts and those with simultaneously issued parts. A cataloger does not always know how a multipart monograph is issued (e.g., a cataloger may have a successively issued set that was purchased later as a complete set; s/he may have only a gift volume or two of a multipart resource in hand) [see also comments in 1.1.2.]. Also, use of more specific terminology (e.g. multipart monographs; serials) enables keyword searching.

CONSER recommends a return to existing practice, with a 2.1.1.x rule devoted to serials alone. It might also be simplest to have 2.1.1 divided into the following categories: single part monograph; multipart monograph; serial; integrating resource. The existing 2.1.1.3 could be divided appropriately among the categories.

##### **2.1.1.1. Resource issued in successive parts**

The name of this rule is not keyword searchable on the term “serials.”

CONSER recommends renaming this rule “Serials” and creating a separate rule for multipart monographs, as mentioned under 2.1.1.

##### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet, ii)**

We understood via a request for clarification on RDA-L that the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing suggested the addition of "not sequentially numbered" at 2.1.1.1 to accommodate multipart resources that have numbered parts which have not been issued in sequence. Many serials catalogers found this interpretation rather confusing, as “not sequentially numbered” has been used to indicate that the parts do not have any numbering that can be used to put the issues in sequence -- not that they were issued out of order. Also, both (i) and (iii) talk about issues or parts that are sequentially numbered,

and (ii) and (iv) talk about unnumbered or not sequentially numbered, which we found overly wordy and confusing.

Serials catalogers have a long history of describing from the first/earliest number. When confronted with bibliographic descriptions NOT based on the first issue, we are always on the lookout to “back up” the description to the first or earliest one. On the other hand, it seems that monographic catalogers working with bibliographic records for multipart monographs are more interested in including the earliest publication date. Another way to say this is that serialists are more interested in coverage dates and contents, whereas monograph catalogers appear to be more focused on publication dates.

CONSER recommends that the list of 4 categories be simplified for serials by removing i) and ii) and simplifying the wording:

- i) a source of information identifying the lowest numbered issue or part available, if the issues or parts are sequentially numbered" (AND leave off "and the first issue or part is not available").
- ii) a source of information identifying the earliest issue or part available, if the issues or parts are unnumbered or not sequentially numbered" (AND leave off "and the earliest issue or part is not available").

A cataloger may provide a note stating “No. 1 published in 1920” (e.g., when date of publication is given as 1919, because no. 2 published in 1919). A note on numbering could also be helpful: “Numbers not issued in numerical order.” If monographic catalogers do not wish to do the maintenance on relevant bibliographic records, we think this would be preferably dealt with as a PCC or local decision.

### **2.1.2. Analytical Description**

#### **c) Parts of integrating resources**

The rule seems to assume that a component part of an integrating resource is also always an integrating resource, which is not always the case (there are occasionally newsletters issued as part of a print integrating resource; a component part of an updating website can be a monograph or serial).

CONSER recommends including instructions to choose sources for component parts that are monographs, serials and updating resources as they would be treated if they were issued alone.

## **2.2. SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

### **2.2.1 - Preferred Source of Information**

#### **2.2.1.1. Resources comprising multiple pages or page images**

**1st bullet**

It is not very clear that this section is also intended to apply to e-journals.

CONSER suggests adding “e-serial” to the list of sample types following the “e.g.” statement.

**2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

CONSER agrees that the wording could be simplified per Adam Schiff’s wording (on RDA-L):

- a) a cover (or cover image)
- b) a caption (or caption image)
- c) a masthead (or masthead image)
- d) a colophon (or colophon image)

and the sentence "or an image of one of the above (in the order of preference indicated)" eliminated.

**3<sup>rd</sup> bullet**

A reference to 2.3.8.3. (Notes on source of title proper) would be helpful.

**2.2.1.4. Other resources**

“Other resources” may include other electronic resources such as Web sites, but may also include electronic serials that are in HTML (not all e-serials are PDF). They do not fit under 2.2.1.1, 2.2.1.2, or 2.2.1.3.

CONSER recommendation: add to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet: “... use as the preferred source of information another source within the resource itself, giving preference to formally presented sources (e.g., a title panel on a folded sheet map; the table of contents for the first issue of an HTML serial; a journal home page for an HTML serial lacking a table of contents; or the home page of an HTML Web site.)”

**2.2.2. More than one Preferred Source of Information**

This rule has dense and difficult wording.

CONSER recommends a rewrite of this rule.

**Section a)**

Sections ii) and iii) seem to be in conflict. We are also not sure whether section a) iii) needs "and translation is not the purpose of the resource" added at the end.

CONSER requests clarification.

## **2.3. TITLE**

### **2.3.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Titles**

#### **2.3.0.2. Sources of information**

CONSER catalogers agree with the change in RDA that parallel titles may be taken from any source within the resource and not just from the chief source.

CONSER recommends that the source of parallel other title information be specified here and that this other title information needs to be from the same source as the relevant parallel title(s).

#### **2.3.0.3. Transcription**

2.3.0.3 (see also 2.3.1.7) state that an exception be made for inaccuracies in the title proper of a resource issued in successive parts, per the instructions in 2.3.1.7.a). This means that for finite multipart monographs where the pieces are issued successively (and for the corresponding SAR, if analyzed), a cataloger would correct an error in the title proper, but for simultaneously published finite multipart monographs the cataloger would not. It is not always possible to tell if multipart monographs are published as is in one set or if parts are issued successively.

CONSER recommends that simultaneously and successively issued multipart monographs be given the same treatment.

#### **Exception**

AACR2 12.1.B.1 (instructions to correct inaccuracies in title) is also currently applied to integrating resources.

CONSER recommends that the exception be designated for both serials and integrating resources in RDA.

#### **2.3.0.4. Names of persons and corporate bodies**

##### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends adding “for instructions on supplying other title information” at the end of the “See also 2.3.3.4” statement.

#### **2.3.1. Title Proper**

### **2.3.1.1. Definition**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends a wording change: “For purposes of description, the title proper includes any alternative title or the designation for the section and/or any section title, but excludes parallel titles and other title information. (see 2.3.2 and 2.3.3).”

### **2.3.1.2. Sources of information**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

The words "for the identification of the resource" make this more confusing. In 2.3.0.2., Sources of information, it just says, "For the title proper, use the preferred source of information as specified in 2.2.1." – which seems sufficient here also.

### ***Choosing the Title Proper***

### **2.3.1.4. Title in two or more forms**

#### **Exception**

The serials exception to choose the full form is important, because it is also included in the rules of the ISSN Manual for the key title and in ISBD(CR) for the title proper. Also, AACR2 12.1.B.2 (instructions to choose full form over acronym as title proper) is currently applied to integrating resources in addition to serials. Was it merely an oversight to leave this out of RDA? We also wonder if it would it not also simplify the rule if the exception were applied to all materials; it would mean less agonizing over presentation on the chief source.

CONSER recommends applying the exception to both serials and integrating resources and considering whether the exception ought to be the rule for all resources.

### ***Recording the Title Proper***

### **2.3.1.7. Basic instructions on recording the title proper**

#### **Exceptions:**

#### **a) Resources issued in successive parts**

2.3.1.7. states that an exception be made for inaccuracies in the title proper of a resource issued in successive parts. This means that for multipart monographs issued successively (and for corresponding SAR if it can be analyzed) and those issued simultaneously (again also for corresponding SAR if it can be analyzed) there are different instructions – which

could be potentially confusing. The comparable AACR2 12.1.B.1 (instructions to correct inaccuracies in title) is also currently applied to integrating resources.

CONSER recommends that the exception be applied to serials and integrating resources only.

#### **b) Serials**

This rule lacks instruction on what to do if the date, name, or number that varies from issue to issue and appears at the end of the title is not grammatically linked. For example, if "Annual report 1996" is the full title of the piece, do you record it as "Annual report..." or just "Annual report"? We also recognize that “hairsplitting decisions” of whether or not the publisher intended the date to be part of the title or not by catalogers may occur.

CONSER recommends revising the first sentence to, “Additionally, for serials, if the title proper includes a date, name, number, etc. ....” CONSER also recommends adding the guideline from LCRI 12.1B7: “If numbering occurs at the end of the title proper without a linking word, do not consider it as part of the title proper.”

### ***Change in the Title Proper***

#### **2.3.1.11. Recording changes in the title proper**

##### **b) Serials**

Paragraph is difficult to read.

CONSER recommends breaking this into two paragraphs so that the instructions for “major changes” and “minor changes” are more readily visible.

#### **2.3.1.12. Major and minor changes**

CONSER recommends that the RDA rules remain harmonized with ISSN rules and ISBD(CR) with respect to major and minor changes in title – as is currently the case in RDA.

CONSER also recommends inclusion of another minor change category in 2.3.12. b), if the first bullet under “1.6.6. Letters or Words Intended to be Read more than Once” remain as it is currently stated in the draft RDA.

### **2.3.2. Parallel Title**

#### **2.3.2.2. Sources of information**

Although this is a change in practice, CONSER agrees that we like the idea of being able to take parallel titles from anywhere on the resource.

### **2.3.2.3. Basic instructions on recording parallel titles**

We understand that the rule is merely saying that a cataloger should record parallel titles, although we find separation of rules from display convention makes it difficult to understand this rule.

CONSER recommends consideration of the idea of moving all parallel titles to notes and removing them from the title statement. This simplification would make the catalog record easier to read.

#### **3rd bullet**

"If an original title in a language different from that of the title proper is presented as an equivalent to the title proper, record it as a parallel title" is basically the same as the 2nd bullet under 2.3.2.1, Definition, "An original title in a language different from that of the title proper that is presented as the equivalent of the title proper is treated as a parallel title." Is that intended duplication?

#### **4<sup>th</sup> bullet**

Are catalogers meant to indicate the source for all parallel titles, even if the parallel titles appear on the source of information?

CONSER recommends this rule be made more explicit.

### **2.3.2.4. Type of composition, medium of performance, key, etc.**

CONSER recommends changing the name of rule to: "Type of composition, medium of performance, key, etc., in parallel titles."

## **2.3.3. Other Title Information**

### **2.3.3.2. Sources of information**

As Adam Schiff suggested, "If you are recording parallel other title information and the parallel title is from a source other than the title proper, then this instruction doesn't work."

CONSER agrees with his recommendation to change the wording to: "Take other title information from the same source as the title proper, or in the case of other parallel title information, from the same source as the parallel title to which it corresponds."



### **2.3.3.3. Basic instructions on recording other title information**

The instructions on when to include serials other title information in AACR2 12.1E1 have been omitted from RDA. This information includes what is a variant title (e.g. an acronym vs full form where acronym is recorded as other title information); statement of responsibility; or a supplied description of the contents when the title consists solely of the name of the corporate body.

CONSER is not in agreement on what we would want to do about “other title information”: a slight majority wants to have the additional text and examples added from AACR2 12.1E1; a slightly smaller group wishes to leave the rule as written in 2.3.3.3; and two CONSER catalogers suggested adding only cataloger supplied information given when the title consists solely of the name of the corporate body.

Since other title information is not a mandatory element in RDA 1.4, CONSER accepts that it may be best to leave the rule as now written and indicate in CONSER documentation those situations when other title information should be included.

### **2.3.3.6. Recording changes in other title information**

#### **a) Multipart monographs, & b) Serials**

The last sentence of both a) and b) state: “If other title information that has been recorded is deleted on a subsequent issue or part, record the deletion in a note (see 2.3.8.4).” This blanket order, however, is modified by rule 2.3.8.4, fourth bullet, which makes clear that this deletion note is only required “if considered to be important.”

CONSER recommends including the phrase “if considered to be important” in 2.3.3.6 as well as in 2.3.8.4.

#### **c) Integrating resources**

##### **2nd paragraph**

This paragraph is a bit difficult to read and may not cover all of the possibilities. The final sentence says "If the changed other title information is not considered to be important (either for identification or for access), delete the other title information, and record it as earlier other title information."

CONSER recommends deleting the other title information from the record and not recording it anywhere, if the cataloger judges the earlier other title to be unimportant. There is also a reference to a non-existent 2.3.5.6c. at the end of this paragraph. If that rule is divided into: a) Multipart monographs, b) Serials, and c) Integrating resources; then the reference will be necessary.

## **2.3.4. Variant Title**

### **2.3.4.1. Definition**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

Other title information is not strictly speaking a type of variant title.

CONSER recommends clarifying that “other title information” may have variant forms that need to be recorded in notes (and access points).

#### **4<sup>th</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends slightly amended wording: “... appearing on a later issue or part of a multipart monograph or serial or on an earlier iteration of an integrating resource ...”

## **2.3.5. Earlier/Later Title**

Serials catalogers are accustomed to thinking/speaking of earlier/later titles as those that are the result of a major change. Since the instructions for dealing with major changes are given in 2.3.1.11, this section could make it clearer in the section headings that it deals with minor changes only.

CONSER suggests changing the heading of this section to: “Earlier/Later Title Variations Not Requiring a New Record.” We are aware that others have suggested combining this rule with 2.3.4 and that may be a helpful simplification.

### **2.3.5.1. Definition**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

“Other title information” is not strictly speaking a title.

CONSER recommends separating the wording of multipart monographs and serials: “... appearing on a subsequent issue or part of a multipart monograph or serial that differs from the first or earliest issue or part and does not require a new record (see 2.3.1.11).” CONSER also recommends clarifying that “other title information” may have variant forms that need to be recorded

### **2.3.5.3. Basic instructions on recording earlier/later titles**

At present, this heading is confusing, because the terminology of “earlier/later titles” has generally been used to indicate only “major changes” to serials catalogers.

CONSER recommends changing the heading of this section to: “Basic instructions on recording earlier/later titles not requiring a new record.”

**1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends adding as a first sentence: "Record major changes to the title proper as instructed in 2.3.1.11."

**2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

Again, the wording references "later titles"; "later titles" indicate "major changes" in title to serials catalogers.

CONSER recommends changing the wording: "For later variations in title appearing in multipart monographs and serials not requiring a new record, indicate the numbering or publication dates to which the change in title applies."

**2.3.5.4. Earlier and later variations in the title proper****b)**

CONSER recommends adding a reference: "See 2.3.1.12 for instructions on determining major and minor changes."

**2.3.5.6. Earlier and later other title information**

There are no instructions about recording earlier/later parallel other title information and there may be instances when a cataloger would consider this to be helpful for the user.

CONSER suggests renaming a) "Multipart monographs and serials," and including information on recording earlier/later parallel other title information.

**2.3.6. Key Title**

The rules do not give instructions on recording abbreviated titles and abbreviated key titles. NLM assigns abbreviated titles to medical titles for indexing purposes. Some CONSER catalogers also routinely add them from the ISSN database, because reference librarians consider them useful for finding and identifying titles.

CONSER recommends the addition of an optional rule (preferably not in 2.3.6.) for recording abbreviated titles, including abbreviated key titles.

**2.3.8. Notes on Titles****2.3.8.3. Source of the title proper**

RDA does not require specifying source of title proper on records for electronic serials. This can be problematic because successive titles are sometimes “buried” within the site under the latest title.

CONSER recommends adding AACR2 9.7B3 wording to RDA: “For remote access resources, “always give the source of the title proper.””

#### **2.3.8.4. Title variations, inaccuracies, and deletions**

##### **3<sup>rd</sup> bullet**

The phrase "a resource issued in successive parts" suggests that multipart monographs issued simultaneously are to be treated differently than multipart monographs issued successively. Again, this is problematic because it is not always possible to tell how multipart monographs have been issued.

CONSER recommends this treatment be applied only to serials and integrating resources (See also comments for 2.3.1.7)

### **2.4. STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY**

#### **2.4.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Statements of Responsibility**

##### **2.4.0.5. Statement naming two or more persons, etc.**

The first bullet provides an option to drop the names of all but the first responsible person or body if there are more than three and, in their place, adding a mark of omission. This is less helpful than AACR2 1.1F5, which required both the mark of omission, and the addition of “[et. al.]”

CONSER recommends adding “[and others]” after the mark of omission to make it the text clearer to users when reading bibliographic records.

##### **2.4.0.6. More than one statement of responsibility**

Examples as given on separate lines are confusing.

CONSER recommends that examples in this rule be shown with some form of punctuation to make the rule clearer.

#### **2.4.1. Parallel Statement of Responsibility**

CONSER recommends adding a definition for "parallel statement of responsibility" (which combines wording from 2.4.0.1 and 2.3.2.1): "a parallel statement of responsibility is a statement which corresponds to the title proper in another language or script, relating to the identification and/or function of any persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for or contributing to the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of a resource."

### **2.4.3. Notes on Statements of Responsibility**

#### **2.4.3.1. Definition**

##### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

The use of corporate bodies in a note is not always done because they have subsidiary roles (or for variant forms of names or changes in statements, as mentioned in 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet). Sometimes it is merely that the statement of responsibility information only appears in a note.

CONSER recommends changing the wording to "... playing roles, including subsidiary ones ..."

#### **2.4.3.3. Editors of serials**

Providing information on editors has been problematic in cataloging serials for many reasons: (1) editors change often; (2) their roles vary from one publication to the next one; (3) sometimes there are so many editors for a publication the cataloger cannot determine who is doing what (even when the publication says what they do); etc.

Although AACR2 12.1F3 says more emphatically to not give notes about editors of serials, the majority of CONSER catalogers agreed that the phrase "any editor considered to be an important means of identifying ..." allows catalogers sufficient leeway to ignore editors. We should mention that a couple of CONSER catalogers stated a preference for this rule to be made optional to make it clearer to catalogers that it is "the exception rather than the rule" to include editor statements.

#### **2.4.3.9. Changes in statement of responsibility**

##### **b)**

A cataloger may not have first/earliest issue or know that information.

CONSER recommends adding the word "described" after "first/earliest issue or part."

## **2.5. EDITION**

## **2.5.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Edition Information**

### **2.5.0.6. Change in edition information**

CONSER recommends dividing the rule into the standard categories: a) Multipart monographs; b) Serials; c) Integrating resources.

#### **b) and c)**

are based on AACR2 12.2F1, which likewise does not specify the conditions under which a new description would be warranted, though it implies that the conditions exist. This information is given instead in LCRI 21.3B as the third additional condition under which a new entry would be made for a serial: “The edition statement changes (see rule 12.1F1) and the change indicates a change in subject matter or a change in physical medium.”

CONSER recommends adding a reference to **b)**: “(see 1.3. for instructions on when to create a new record)”; and to **c)** “(see 1.3 for instructions on when to create a new record).”

### **2.5.1. Edition Statement**

#### **2.5.1.5. Terms indicating regular revision or numbering**

CONSER recommends changing the wording to: "For multipart monographs, serials and integrating resources ..." rather than "For resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources ...." Also, the reference in the first paragraph should be “(see 2.11)” and the one in the second paragraph should be “(see 2.6.)”

#### **2.5.1.7. Parallel edition statement**

CONSER suggests that it would be helpful to define “parallel edition statement.”

#### **Optional statement**

CONSER thinks it would be helpful to show how these multiple statements would look if given in an ISBD or other display format.

### **2.5.5. Notes on Edition Information**

#### **2.5.5.3. Source of the edition information**

Why are digital resources to be treated differently from any other type of resource? When the edition information comes from a source different than that of the title proper in a book or score or video, catalogers record it without giving a note about that source. If a

cataloger is not required to give the source note for a book, why would s/he need to give it for the PDF version of that book?

CONSER recommends deletion of this rule.

#### **2.5.5.5. Changes in edition information**

For serials and integrating resources, sometimes a change in edition statement requires that a new description to be made (e.g. when a serial splits into two different regional editions). Although a reference is given to 2.5.0.6 c) for integrating resources, and to 2.5.0.6. b) for serials, this rule needs to state that the cataloger should also determine whether or not a new description is necessary.

CONSER recommends structuring this rule into: a) Multipart monographs; b) Serials; and c) Integrating resources, and changing the wording for b) and c) as given below.

##### **b) Serials**

“Make notes on differences in edition information from one part to another if they are considered to be important (see 2.5.0.6a) and do not require a new record (see 1.3). If the changes ...”

##### **c) Integrating resources**

“Make notes on edition information no longer present on the current iteration, or that appeared in a different form on earlier iterations, if they are considered to be important (see 2.5.0.6c) and do not require a new record (see 1.3.). If the changes ...”

## **2.6. NUMBERING**

### **General concerns**

CONSER understands that RDA only stipulates which elements of information should be included in a description, while it is neutral concerning the presentation of these elements. However, we are not certain what the intention of RDA is -- to separate the recording of alpha/numeric designations from the chronological designations, both when the designations are expressed for single items and when they are expressed as ranges of items. Nor does the layout of the numeric and chronological designations on different lines in the examples in 2.6. make it clear. The impression is further reinforced by the division of the sections in 2.6; that is, alpha/numeric designation is presented in a different section from that of the chronological designation. Nor is there any explicit instruction as to how to record such combinations of alpha/numeric and chronological designations (as is currently given in AACR2 12.3.C3), and only the scantiest of examples (those in 2.6.4 for completed serials).

Within systems with higher degrees of granularity for numbering, the same information could be displayed as:

v. 3, no. 6-v. 5, no. 3 (Aug./Sept. 1970-Mar. 1972)

or

Enumeration: v. 3, no. 6-v. 5, no. 3

Chronology: Aug./Sept. 1970-Mar. 1972

or some other variation.

There are three possible solutions:

- Restructure RDA 2.6. Instead of separating numeric designation and chronological designation into different rules, cover the following: alpha/numeric designation; chronological designation; and combined alpha/numeric and chronological designations. The current version says we must use both, when both are present, but this needs to be more explicit.
- Provide numbering examples in ISBD punctuation, with a caveat that ISBD punctuation/display is used only to make the examples clearer. Many of us find the examples difficult to understand without punctuation. There is some precedent for this in 0.1.9.
- Provide examples of different display standards for numbering punctuation in Appendix D (although many of us would prefer not to have to turn to an Appendix so see how to do formatting within an area)

## Display

It has become increasingly clear that users do not understand the intended meaning of formatted numbering statements; such formatted statements are also more time-consuming for catalogers to create than unformatted ones. Users often misinterpret numbering information to be holdings information; i.e. they assume we hold all of the volumes of a title if a formatted statement such as “Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1995)-“ is used. Catalogers spend a lot of time checking the rules to determine exactly how to record numbering that is not presented on a serial in the standard format. Perhaps we need to reconsider how we have been dealing with this area of the catalog record. It would be more understandable to users to see notes such as “Began with: Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 2003); ceased with: Vol. 2, no. 4 (Sept. 2004).” and it would be less time consuming for catalogers to use an unformatted note, rather than needing to check for the “correct” format and abbreviations currently used in numbering.

CONSER recommends that RDA be changed to incorporate use of an unformatted note as an option for transcribing numbering. If the option is added, RDA would also need to address how to provide information on transcribing on new sequence(s) of numbering (e.g., multiple notes) and alternative numbering systems (e.g., in notes) in an unformatted style. CONSER also recommends that the optional rule require a “Description based on:”



note be used in conjunction with an unformatted note for the numbering of the first/earliest issue or part.

The use of a “Latest issue consulted:” note as described in AACR2 12.7B23 has been omitted from RDA. CONSER recommends that a “Latest issue consulted:” note be used whenever the cataloger has more than one issue in hand; these notes help later catalogers understand the scope of the resource described in the bibliographic record.

## **Punctuation**

Although RDA has relegated ISBD punctuation to an appendix, in other cases RDA is not completely neutral with respect to punctuation standards and what punctuation present is from ISBD/AACR2. Examples include:

- The comma dividing the levels of enumeration and chronology are an ISBD/AAR2 convention; ANSI standard uses “:” to divide levels of enumeration.
- The spacing between the captions and the data is also an ISBD/AACR2 convention. The example Vol. 1, no. 1-v. 10, no. 12 would be expressed in ANSI as: v.1:no.1-v.10:no.12.
- The order of the enumeration and chronology data in the examples is also from ISBD/AACR2. The ANSI standard requires that data be expressed in hierarchical order. Thus, the example

Vol. 3, no. 6-v. 5, no. 3  
Aug./Sept. 1970-Mar. 1972

would be expressed in ANSI as v.3:no.6-v.5:no.3 (1970:Aug./Sept.-1972:Mar.) or v.3:no.6 (1970:Aug./Sept.)-v.5:no.3 (1972:Mar.).

The 2.6 rules are written as though all systems will encode the beginning numbering followed by the ending numbering of a numbering sequence, and use ISBD punctuation (hyphen indicating range of items). This is not necessarily the case.

If the intention of RDA is to be neutral with respect to punctuation, then it should be stripped from the examples, but it hasn’t been for the sake of clarity (e.g., the comma to divide levels of enumeration, etc.). This strengthens the case that it might be better to write all examples with one standard (presumably, but not necessarily ISBD), while specifying it is there for the purpose of demonstrating the examples and not meant to limit the punctuation standard to that standard.

The section should be rewritten without the use of the punctuation sign of ‘-’ (hyphen). That is, RDA should stipulate only that the beginning designation and ending designation should be recorded, without prescribing how they should be encoded or displayed. Some metadata systems may tag and display this information in separate lines:

Began with: v.1:no.1 (1980:Jan.)

Ceased with: v.10:no.7 (1989:July)

Prescribing the use of the hyphen to separate elements is an ISBD and ANSI convention that may not be applicable to another punctuation standard, and furthermore assumes that display of beginning and ending designations will be displayed in the same string/line in a formatted note. 2.6.4. also explicitly instructs that the beginning designation should be followed by the designation of the last issue; the examples show this separated by a hyphen. It should be more neutral about recording the first and last designation (i.e., not stipulate punctuation, order, or display).

In conjunction with stripping out the implicit bias that all users will be encoding numbering information in formatted and unformatted MARC 362 tags, CONSER recommends that 2.14. be amended to include an option to note the basis of description even when the basis for the description was the first issue or part of the resource described. Permitting the option for a “description based on:” note even when the first part of an item is in hand would permit clarification of which item was used for description in systems where the tagging itself does not convey to technicians whether the first part was in hand at time of constructing the description. It would then be possible to have:

Began with: v.1:no.1 (1980:Jan.)

Ceased with: v.10:no.7 (1989:July)

Description based on: v.1:no.1 (1980:Jan.)

Note that use of parenthesis in the examples to enclose chronology also implies chronology will be on the same line as enumeration – another ISBD/ANSI convention.

In AACR2, two rules state “but not necessarily with the same punctuation” in reference to the recording of numbering (12.3B1, 12.3C1). This has been a useful instruction in avoiding numbering that is confusing to users, e.g., a slash is used to indicate combined coverage in an issue (e.g., 2000/2001; Vol. 1, no. 1/2) rather than give the appearance of being two separate issues. It has also enabled us to avoid the “double hyphen problem” to separate the recording of ambiguous numbering for the first and last issues (e.g. 2000-2001-2002-2003 could be the numbering statement for either one or two issues). However, CONSER also believes that transcription of such designations should be determined by whatever standard is being used by the agency making the description.

In ANSI/NISO Z39.71 1999, both adjacent and separate display of the chronological designation is permissible when expressing numbering for a range of items. Thus,

v.:no.1 (1943:Nov.)-v.10:no.12 (1953:June) [adjacent chronology]

may also be displayed as:

v.1:no.1-v.10:no.12 (1943:Nov.-1953:June) [separate chronology]

The ISBD/AACR2 standard currently used uses an adjacent display only:

Vol. 1, no. 1(Nov. 1943)-v.10, no.12 (June 1953)

Because all of the examples in RDA use the separated chronological designations and are given on different lines, it seems that RDA is dictating display of the chronological designations separate from the numeric designations either on the same line or on a separate line, and barring the display of chronological designation adjacent to the alpha/numeric designation as currently used in ISBD. If RDA is neutral respecting display punctuation, either option is acceptable and this needs to be made clearer to the readers.

## **Specific comments**

### **2.6.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Numbering**

#### **2.6.0.2. Sources of information**

##### **1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

This rule requires that the cataloger “take numbering information from the same source as the title proper” -- and only if it does not appear there can the cataloger “take it from another source within the resource itself.” This is a change from the current instruction in AACR2 12.0.B3, in which the prescribed source for numbering is “the whole resource”; in addition, LCRI 12.3 tells the cataloger to “generally prefer the most complete presentation.” The AACR2 rule was changed earlier because of the difficulty in presentation of numbering on periodicals – and serials catalogers would prefer a return to the flexibility created with being able to choose the most complete source from the entire resource. Also, sometimes there is more than one numbering scheme (i.e. volume and issue numbering as well as continuous numbering) that do not appear on the same source.

CONSER recommends new wording in place of the first two bullets: “Take numbering information for the first/earliest issue or part from any source within the resource, preferring a source with the most complete information.”

##### **4<sup>th</sup> bullet**

Again, it is not necessarily helpful to take numbering information only from the chief source.

CONSER recommends changed wording: “Take numbering information identifying the last issue or part from any source within the resource with the most information.”

##### **5<sup>th</sup> bullet**

Again, the same problem exists as described above with needing information from the entire resource. Also, a cataloger may have first and/or last issue for any given sequence of numbering.

CONSER recommends changing the wording: “Take numbering identifying the first and/or last issue or part in a separate sequence of numbering (see 2.6.5) from the entire resource, preferring a source with the most complete presentation.”

### **2.6.0.3. Transcription**

This rule requires an exact transcription (taking into account the 1.6. exceptions), but if the intention is to be punctuation neutral, an exact transcription should not be required. 2.6.0.3. assumes that ISBD is followed, including the instruction to transcribe the numbering as it appears on the item in hand. If another punctuation standard is permissible for display, then these instructions should be eliminated from the text, e.g., the guidelines on transcribing the order of the elements as they appear on the items, with only the exception for years used as volume numbering divided internally by numbered pieces to be transposed -- in ANSI, chronology would also be transposed. Also, if we are trying to best identify the issue, a cataloger does not necessarily transcribe in the order in which it appears, particularly for chronology (e.g., example in 2.6.2.3. of Jan./Feb. 1964).

## **2.6.2. Chronological Designation**

### **2.6.2.1. Definition**

A chronological designation may have more than 2 levels.

CONSER recommends changing the “e.g.” statement: “(e.g., year; year and month; year, day and month)

### **2.6.2.3. Recording chronological designations**

Examples are problematic (e.g., usage of ‘/’ in numbering). In ANSI, 1961/2 would be recorded as 1961/1962, 97-1 would be converted to 1997:1, and 1998-1 would be converted to 1998:1. Again, the examples assume use ISBD format and punctuation.

CONSER recommends use of the ‘/’ to indicate a span of numbers or dates.

## **2.6.5. New Sequence of Numbering**

The examples illustrating new sequences of numbering show the new numbering system(s) on separate lines, leaving us the impression that these numbering systems must also be contained in multiple areas/notes and also displayed separately. It is not clear whether it would be correct and permissible to display as one contiguous area or not:

Vol. 1, no. 1 (Nov. 1943)-v. 10, no. 12 (June 1953) ; no. 1 (July 1974)-

### **2.6.6. Alternative Numbering Systems**

Since alternative numbering systems are presented on separate lines in the text, it is not clear that alternative numbering could still be expressed on the same line, using the “=” to precede the alternative numbering (use of “=” precedes alternative numbering in ISBD and ANSI).

### **2.6.7. Notes on Numbering**

#### **2.6.7.1. Definition**

CONSER recommends that the definition for notes on numbering include “numbering errors” in the categories: “A note on numbering is a note providing information on beginning and ending numbering not recorded in the numbering element, complex or irregular numbering, numbering errors, or the period covered by a volume, issue, part, etc.”

#### **2.6.7.3. Beginning and ending numbering not recorded in the numbering element**

AACR2 rule 12.7B11.1, 2nd part has been split into two RDA rules: 2.6.7.3 (notes relating to numbering) and 2.9.6.3 (notes relating to date of publication). Presumably, these could be combined into a single note as under AACR2 (and with a see reference from 2.9.6.3)

CONSER recommends use of a note combining numbering and date, as necessary.

### **2.7. PUBLISHER, DISTRIBUTOR, ETC.**

#### **2.7.4. Notes on Publisher, Distributor, etc.**

##### **2.7.4.4. Change in name of publisher, distributor, etc.**

CONSER recommends dividing this rule by: a) Multipart monographs; b) Serials; c) Integrating resources.

**b) Resources issued in successive parts** (which CONSER recommends changing to ‘Serials’)

A cataloger does not necessarily have the first/earliest issue or part in hand or know that information.

CONSER recommends adding the word “described” after “... the first/earliest issue or part”.

## **2.8. PLACE OF PUBLICATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC.**

### **2.8.5. Notes on Place of Publication, Distribution, etc.**

#### **2.8.5.4. Change in place of publication, distribution, etc.**

CONSER recommends dividing this rule by: a) Multipart monographs; b) Serials; c) Integrating resources.

**b) Resources issued in successive parts** (which CONSER recommends changing to ‘Serials’)

A cataloger does not necessarily have the first/earliest issue or part in hand or know that information.

CONSER recommends adding the word “described” after “... the first/earliest issue or part.”

## **2.9. DATE OF PUBLICATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC.**

### **2.9.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Date of Publication, Distribution, etc.**

#### **2.9.0.1. Definition**

##### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

This bullet would be easier to read if its contents were also given in bulleted list format.

#### **2.9.0.2. Sources of information**

##### **5<sup>th</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends adding wording to the last bullet: "Take the ending date of publication, distribution, etc., for an integrating resource that has ceased publication from the last iteration."

#### **2.9.0.5. Resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources**

CONSER recommends that the heading for the section be changed to: “Multipart monographs, serials and integrating resources”.

##### **4<sup>th</sup> bullet**

CONSER concurs with a comment made by Adam Schiff (on RDA-L) that for an updating loose-leaf it would be better to leave off the closing date until the last update is published. In the example, it looks as if the publication has ceased – which may be

misleading to the user. Updates should be treated as if they were “iterations” and the closing date taken from the final update when it is published.

## **2.10. SERIES**

### **2.10.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Series Information**

#### **2.10.0.1. Definition**

The definition of “series information” does not take into account that not all series entries are for "series" titles. Some of the series entries on records are for monographic set titles, where the monographic set has been analyzed.

CONSER recommends that the definition of series include wording indicating that a series can be finite or continuing; it would also be helpful to include ISSN as part of the definition of series information.

#### **2.10.0.2. Sources of information**

This paragraph would be easier to read if it were given in a bulleted list format.

### **2.10.6. Numbering Within Series**

#### **2.10.6.4. Chronological designation**

Here in the series area is the instruction for recording both enumeration and chronology when both are present. Why is there no parallel instruction in RDA 2.6.?

CONSER recommends that the heading for this rule be “Numbering” and not “Chronological designation.” Also, the examples need to be made clearer using ISBD or other display format.

#### **2.10.6.6. Alternative numbering systems**

The example as presented is confusing.

#### **2.10.6.7. Separately numbered issues or parts**

##### **a) Multipart monographs**

Why do multipart need to be “simultaneously issued” in this situation?

## **2.10.7. Subseries**

### **2.10.7.1. Definition**

The use of the word “section” in this definition is somewhat confusing, since sections have a different use/meaning for serial titles.

CONSER suggests that using the word “part” may be better in this definition.

## **2.10.8. Resource in More than One Series**

### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

Neither AACR2 nor RDA gives instructions on what to do when a resource is issued as part of multiple series. It is often helpful to provide date or volume range information before each multiple series title(s).

CONSER recommends adding a sentence to this rule: “If the date and/or volume range is known for the publication span of the series, include the information at the beginning of the series statement.” CONSER also recommends adding a reference to 2.10.7.6., in cases of doubt whether a series statement is a subseries or second series.

## **2.11. Frequency**

### **2.11.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Frequency**

#### **2.11.0.3. Recording frequency**

Use of periods at the end of the frequency statements is confusing.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

In the first example, why are the elements of the note run together, given that similar elements of information in other areas (such as numbering) which are usually run together in transcription and display are not? However, CONSER catalogers do think this example is clearer than others that remove punctuation.

## **2.12. RESOURCE IDENTIFIER**

### **2.12.1. Standard Number**

#### **2.12.1.3. Incorrect standard numbers**



## **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

Serials catalogers do not identify “corrected” ISSN as such, since that is a function of the ISSN centers. We understand that ISBNs may be corrected by monograph catalogers.

CONSER recommends changing the wording to say: “If the correct ISBN can be readily ascertained, record it and add (corrected) to it.” Please omit the corrected ISSN example.

### **2.12.1.4. Qualification**

## **3<sup>rd</sup> bullet**

This rule needs to mention that updating loose-leaves may be assigned both an ISBN and ISSN.

### **2.14. Issue, Part, or Iteration used as the Basic for the Description**

#### **2.14.1. Issue or part used as the basis for the description of a serial or multipart monograph**

##### **a)**

This instruction for recording the earliest and latest issues consulted follows the current rule in AACR2 12.7B23a, i.e., that they should both be recorded in a single note. Because many serials catalogers found the resulting note to be overly complex, a LCRI was added that states: “The “Description based on” note may be combined with a “Source of title” note (see rule 12.7B23) but not with a “Latest issue consulted” note. If needed, always give a “Latest issue consulted” note as a separate note.” Separate notes also facilitate constant data records, editing macros, etc., which makes catalogers work easier.

CONSER recommends that the LCRI treatment be added to 2.14.1. a).

## **CHAPTER 3. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION**

### **3.1. General Guidelines on Technical Description**

#### **3.1.3. Facsimiles and Reproductions**

An option to provide the opposite instruction for recording the technical description of the original manifestation in this area and the technical description of the reproduction or facsimile in a note would be helpful. The US cataloging community has been using this approach for years for many reasons (e.g., we believe users of reproductions are more interested in the original date, place of publication, publisher, pagination, standard numbers, etc., than the date reproduced, etc.; it is much easier for catalogers to clone records for a reproduction (digital, print or microform) from the original print record,

adding information relating to the reproduction in a note, than it is to create an original record for a reproduction).

CONSER recommends inclusion of an option to record the technical description of the original manifestation in the body of the description and the technical description of the reproduction or facsimile in a note. If RDA is supposed to be “presentation-neutral”, it would be preferable if the decision on whether to use a note for details about the original or reproduction was a local decision. We think this could be achieved independently of the rules via a code or indicator value in the MARC fields (e.g., a new subfield could indicate the type of reproduction, if applicable).

### **3.4. Extent**

#### **3.4.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Extent**

##### **3.4.0.2. Sources of information**

This rule (and many other 3.X.X.2 rules) duplicates 3.1.1. Could these duplications be eliminated?

##### **3.4.0.3. Recording extent**

Under “microform resources” (and audio resources, moving image resources, etc.) it says to record the number of units for the type of carrier as found under 3.3.X. For serials issued in another format, this would be left blank until title had ceased.

##### **3.4.0.6. Resources issued in successive parts**

CONSER recommends replacing the heading for this rule with “Multipart monographs and serials,” or separating the rule into separate rules (one for multipart, one for serials) to enable keyword searching in the electronic RDA (– we recommend this also in several other rules elsewhere in this chapter in headings and/or in the text).

The abbreviation “v.” by itself (as often occurs with serials) in this area is confusing for users. CONSER recommends that there be an option to not include the abbreviation “v.” or a fuller form in the bibliographic record until the serial has ceased and the correct number of bibliographic volumes is known.

Also, the use of “v.” or “vol.” occurs here and elsewhere in the record (i.e. in the Numbering area and in notes). A majority of the CONSER catalogers have come to the conclusion that the terms in the technical description should no longer be abbreviated. Users do not understand many of these abbreviated terms (e.g., “v.”, “ill.”, “parts.”, “ms.” – perhaps even “p.”) that were used to save space on catalog cards. We think it would be preferable to spell out such terms to help users more easily identify what they’re looking for.

If abbreviations are still seen as the preferred form by other catalogers, CONSER also discussed a change in the abbreviations (e.g., from “v.” to “vol.”, from “ill.” to “illus.”) and, for the most part, CONSER catalogers agreed that a fuller form of the abbreviations would be more user friendly, though at least one person still preferred use of “v.” CONSER also generally expressed a preference to use only one abbreviation consistently to simplify cataloger’s work, whatever that abbreviation is.

### **3.4.1. Pages, Leaves, Etc.**

#### **3.4.1.10. Double leaves**

Use of word “oriental” -- is there a less offensive word to use?

### ***Resource Comprising Two or More Units***

#### **3.4.1.14. Continuously paged units**

Some 19<sup>th</sup> century serials are continuously paged throughout the entire run, so this rule may affect them. The rule should not be limited to “two or more units issued simultaneously.”

CONSER recommends use of: “If a resource is a multipart monograph or serial, and the units are continuously paged ...” to enable keyword searching in rule and also in the optional statement: “... continuously paged [not page] multipart monograph or serial as instructed above.”

#### **3.4.1.15. Individually paged units**

##### **1<sup>st</sup> bullet**

Again, reword for keyword searching capability, “If the resource comprises a multipart monograph of two or more units, and ...”

#### **3.4.1.16. Number of bibliographic units differing from number of physical units**

It is not clear whether this rule is meant to include serials or not -- it's under the general heading of "Resource Comprising Two or More Units." In the past, serials catalogers used this instruction for reprints of serials to indicate the difference between bibliographic volumes of the original title and the number of physical units of the reprint. However, it may be difficult to keep track of the latter for serials (e.g., physical units may also be bound or rebound together by the library itself).

CONSER recommends this rule be applied only to multipart monographs.

### **3.4.5. Notes on Extent**

#### **3.4.5.1. Definition**

Circular definition.

#### **3.4.5.4. Resource issued in successive parts not to be continued**

We question whether this rule applies to serials.

CONSER recommends the heading be changed to "Multipart monograph issued in successive parts" or just "Multipart monograph."

### **3.5. Dimensions**

#### **3.5.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Dimensions**

##### **3.5.0.3. Recording dimensions**

##### **chart, Microform resources**

Microfiches: CONSER questions whether it might not be easier to record size in all cases, since having exceptions often means the cataloger has to verify them in the rules to ensure s/he remembers them correctly.

##### **3.5.0.7. Change in dimensions**

##### **a)**

CONSER recommends changing the wording to "multipart monographs and serials."

#### **3.5.6. Notes on Dimensions**

##### **3.5.6.4. Change in dimensions**

Separate rule into a) Multipart monographs; b) Serials; c) Integrating resources, OR change heading of a) to: "Multipart monographs and serials"

### **3.6. Other Technical Details**

### **3.6.0. Basic Instructions on Recording other Technical Details**

#### **3.6.0.3. Recording other technical details**

##### **3<sup>rd</sup> bullet**

CONSER recommends no longer using abbreviations, such as “ill.” and “col.” because library users generally do not understand what they mean. See comments under earlier rules.

#### **3.6.0.5. Change in other technical details**

##### **a) Resource issued in successive parts**

Again, CONSER recommends using “multipart monographs and serials” instead of “resource issued in successive parts.”

### **3.6.6. Illustrative Matter**

#### **3.6.6.1. Definition**

Another circular definition.

#### **3.6.6.3. Recording illustrative matter**

Patrons generally do not understand what the abbreviation “ill.” (or “col.” or “parts.”) means in bibliographic records.

CONSER generally recommends no longer using such abbreviations or, as a second choice, returning to the use of “illus.”

### **3.6.13. Notes on Other Technical Details**

#### **3.6.13.10. Change in other technical details**

##### **a) Resource issue in successive parts**

CONSER recommends changing heading to “multipart monographs and serials”

### **3.7. Accompanying Material**

#### **3.7.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Accompanying Material**

#### **3.7.0.4. Accompanying material intended to be issued regularly**

##### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

use phrase “multipart monograph or serial” instead of “resource issued in successive parts.”

### **3.9. Equipment and System Requirements**

#### **3.9.0. Basic Instructions on Describing Equipment and System Requirements**

##### **3.9.0.4. System requirements for a digital resource**

CONSER recommends adding "if it is considered to be important" to the first sentence.

## **CHAPTER 4. CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

### **4.10. RELATED CONTENT**

The heading “Related Content” does not completely identify the contents of the rule.

CONSER recommends calling this rule “Bibliographic History and Relationships with other Resources” (as in AACR2 12.7B8).

#### **4.10.1. Preceding, Succeeding, and Simultaneously Issued Resources**

##### **4.10.1.2. Merger**

##### **2<sup>nd</sup> bullet**

The example in non-catalog entry form is not helpful, because hotlinking makes the use of catalog entry form in linking fields critical in some OPACs.

CONSER recommends giving examples in standard entry form.

##### **4.10.1.6. Simultaneous edition**

CONSER recommends changing the name of this section to: “Simultaneous editions or formats.” and including a rule about making notes for other formats in which a resource is available, e.g. microform, print, electronic, and providing examples (e.g., “Also issued online.”; “Also issued in microfilm.”)

## **CHAPTER 6. ITEM-SPECIFIC INFORMATION**

### **6.4. RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS**

#### **6.4.0. Basic Instructions on Recording Restrictions on Access**

##### **6.4.0.1. Definition**

In today's electronic world, restrictions on access often refer to ability to access information online.

CONSER recommends removal of the word "physical" from the definition.

## **Appendix D. PRESENTATION OF DESCRIPTIVE DATA**

The instructions for ISBD presentation in appendix D omit the spaces preceding and succeeding most marks of prescribed punctuation (This was true in AACR2 as well).

CONSER recommends aligning the spacing conventions for ISBD presentation in appendix D with those actually set out in ISBD(G), ISBD(CR), etc., since we already do this in practice.